

Advisory Team: Accountability Task Force

MINUTES

DECEMBER 6, 2016

9:00AM-12:00PM Londergan Hall, Room 15, Concord, NH

ADVISORY TEAM LEADS	Scott Mantie, Paul Leather, and Sandra MacDonald, NH DOE
CONSULTANTS	Scott Marion, Susan Lyons and Juan D'Brot, Center for Assessment
NOTE TAKER	Susan Lyons and Juan D'Brot, Center for Assessment
ATTENDEES	MC Barry, Jim O'Rourke, Natasha Kolehmainen, Winfried Feneberg, Julie Heon, Mike Jette, Tammy Davis, George Shea, Virginia Barry, Scott Mantie, Paul Leather, Mary Steady
OBSERVERS	Susan Morgan, Aaron Hughes,
PRE-READ MATERIALS	Regulations Press Release: http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/index.html ; EdWeek post on new regulations: http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2016/11/ed_dept_releases_final_account.html ; Proposed School Accountability Model Document; Credential Engine One-Pager

DISCUSSION	
OBJECTIVES FOR MEETING: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understanding final accountability regulations 2. Making decisions about the postsecondary readiness indicator for high schools 3. Reviewing a proposed equity indicator for elementary and middle school 4. Getting inspiration for reporting dashboards. 	
9:00	Welcome and Policy Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Paul Leather and Scott Mantie, NH DOE <p><u>Discussion:</u> Paul Leather opens the meeting by discussing the need to move toward a full model for accountability, noting that it is important to the timeline for submitting their Consolidated Plan. There is also a brief discussion focusing on the newly released ESSA Accountability Regulations and that our work should be aligned to the current regulations.</p>
9:15	Overview of what is new in the final ESSA Accountability Regulations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Scott Marion, Susan Lyons & Juan D'Brot, Center for Assessment <p><u>Discussion:</u> Scott Marion opens the next agenda item by describing several salient changes that are present in the latest version of the ESSA Accountability Regulations. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release Timeline: While the final regulations have been released, there is a difference between the president-elect's inauguration and when the regulations go into effect (i.e., 7 days following the inauguration). However, the Task Force should treat the regulations as final. • Implementation timeline: The U.S. Department of Education (ED) has revised the implementation timeline to require states to identify schools during the 2018-2019 school year using 2017-2018 data. • Reporting: There has been clarification to the requirements for overall ratings, which note that—at minimum—states must classify schools using an overall rating of Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), or Unidentified schools. It is up to the state to determine how to meaningfully differentiate schools further, if at all. • School identification: The NH DOE and the Center for Assessment will continue to examine the regulations and proposed system to mitigate against an over-identification of TSI schools based on CSI schools not exiting after 3 years. • 1204 regulations: The NH DOE and the Center for Assessment must still review the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority regulations before making further decisions on how to best leverage PACE in the New Hampshire Accountability System. • The role of subgroups: The Center for Assessment and the NH DOE will continue to examine the regulations to determine exactly how subgroups will impact the NH Accountability System.
9:45	Overall Model review and decision-making about College and Career Readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Susan Lyons, Center for Assessment

Discussion: Susan Lyons opens the next agenda item by presenting changes to the overall accountability model based on feedback received from the Task Force during the November meeting. This includes a discussion of the overall models for elementary and middle schools and for high schools. The discussion also focuses on the individual indicators of the proposed system and how the system may differ from the identification of TSI and CSI schools.

The Task Force proceeded to discuss a variety of topics in relation to both the elementary/middle and high school models. These topics can be grouped into the following categories:

- **College vs. Career vs. Life-ready:** A major portion of this agenda item was devoted to framing the idea of college and career vs. career and college and how these concepts should interact with life ready. This was further clarified to depend on whether the answer was addressing a question of school and LEA accountability or if it was addressing a larger belief around continuous improvement and preparing students for future endeavors. This could be seen in Task Force comments that career-, college-, and life-readiness should not be treated as disjunctive requirements for students but should instead be expected of all students. When focusing on high-stakes accountability, the Task Force confirmed the decision to treat certain indicators as disjunctive to allow schools to demonstrate readiness in a variety of ways.

After clarifying that this conversation should remain within the realm of high-stakes accountability and those indicators to which schools should be held accountable, the Task Force recommended that instead of 3 distinct pathways, the NH Accountability System should be conceptualized as requiring schools to demonstrate students have met a series of indicators from 3 categories in a Venn Diagram that includes college-oriented requirements, career-oriented requirements, and a common set of requirements regardless of a student's academic focus (e.g., including indicators like GPA, attendance, etc.). This reinforced the Task Force recommendation that the term *career* should precede the term *college* in career- and college-ready.

- **Communication:** The Task Force noted that communicating the accountability system effectively may be difficult and thus recommended that the documentation created by the department support local understanding of the information presented and how to best use those data in subsequent decision making. In addition to the comments focusing on logistics and resources to support communication, the Task Force recommended that the accountability system clearly reflects the conceptual shift away from diploma-giving to preparing students for post-secondary success. While this may partially addressed by the school quality/student success indicator, the NH DOE should prioritize this message in conversations and communications with parents and educators.
- **Beyond accountability indicators:** The Task Force raised the idea of incentivizing certain behaviors as part of the accountability and improvement process—an idea that has emerged throughout Task Force meetings. It emerged that the Task Force did not believe the accountability system should mandate certain behaviors that were associated with accountability, but instead that the accountability system should drive an internal locus of local accountability. This may be done by integrating certain requirements into either reporting or requirements for LEAs and schools. For example, the accountability system might include language about root-cause analysis or needs assessments as part of the school's improvement plan that are intended to yield long-term improvement in accountability indicators. Furthermore, the Task Force noted the possibility of linking school-level reports to school- or LEA-specific websites where schools and LEAs can display additional information that is used in continuous improvement efforts.

10:30 A proposed equity indicator for elementary and middle schools

✓ Scott Marion, Center for Assessment

Discussion: Scott Marion began the next agenda item by describing a possible approach for operationalizing an equity indicator in the NH Accountability System. This indicator would be based on NH's current growth model approach—student growth percentiles (SGPs)—and basing a school's equity indicator on the performance of the lowest performing 25% of students. The primary focus on this agenda item was a discussion on SGP, how the lowest 25% would be identified, how it would be operationalized, and what kind of unintended consequences might exist.

The Task Force indicated general support for the approach but demonstrated some concern on whether there would be too narrow of a focus on achievement or if focusing on the lowest 25% might impede resource allocation or acquisition. Following additional clarification about the universally applicable nature of the equity indicator, Task Force members were more supportive of including this in the accountability system.

11:15 Innovations in Reporting Dashboards

✓ Juan D'Brot, Center for Assessment

Discussion: Juan D'Brot opened the next agenda item by focusing on how reporting has evolved since the early requirements of *No Child Left Behind*. He described various ways that the Task Force may want to report accountability indicators, which included examples from Illinois, Ohio, Alaska, and Wisconsin. These ranged from report card-style approaches to dashboard-like approaches with varying levels of drill-down and filtering. The discussion concluded with a need to first prioritize the goal of the reporting system and whether the Task Force preferred reporting against some standard (i.e., to be later determined using data) or whether comparison information to other sites (e.g., schools, districts, statewide) were also important. The Task Force expressed support for a minimalist approach for state reporting that could be built into something bigger over time. Additionally, Paul Leather put forth the idea to create a state-wide page where the state can showcase its vision along with key outcomes such as NAEP and SAT data.

12:00 Adjourn, Next meeting ✓ January 20 9:00-12:30		
CONCLUSIONS		
Thank you for the valuable participation and input from the task force members. We will work to prepare a first draft of the accountability system report to present to the Task Force for feedback. As with other meetings, any relevant pre-reading materials will be sent in advance.		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Compile accountability report draft	Center for Assessment	January 17
Pre-reading	Task Force	January 17